

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| In the matter of |) | |
| |) | |
| Telecommunications Relay Services |) | CC Docket No. 98-67 |
| And Speech-to-Speech Services for |) | |
| Individuals with Hearing and Speech |) | |
| Disabilities |) | |

ORDER

Adopted: December 31, 2001

Released: December 31, 2001

By the Senior Deputy Chief, Common Carrier Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Before us are requests for waiver filed by Hamilton Telephone Company (Hamilton)¹ and Sprint Communications (Sprint).² Both Hamilton and Sprint request temporary waiver of certain mandatory minimum requirements for providing Video Relay Services (VRS).³ VRS allows a telecommunications relay services (TRS) user with a hearing and/or speech disability who uses American Sign Language (ASL) to communicate with a voice telephone user through video equipment installed at either the premises of the person with the disability or another appropriate location and at the relay center.⁴ A customer initiates a VRS call utilizing high speed access and a video camera to the Video Interpreting Operator (VIO) center.⁵ Once the connection is made between the caller and the center, the caller uses ASL to state his or her intent to place an outgoing call. An outgoing voice connection is made to the intended receiver over traditional telephone lines. After the connection, the parties then communicate through a qualified interpreter at the VIO center.⁶ Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) rules require that VRS communications assistants (CAs) be qualified interpreters, defined as being able to interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially, both receptively and expressively, using any necessary specialized vocabulary.⁷ VRS is generally subject to the same

¹ Hamilton Telephone Company, *Request for Clarification and Temporary Waiver* (filed Apr. 6, 2001) (*Hamilton Waiver Request*).

² Sprint Communications *Petition for Temporary Waiver* (filed June 4, 2001) (*Sprint Waiver Request*).

³ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.603, 64.604. VRS was previously referred to as video relay interpreting (VRI). We now use the term VRS in place of VRI.

⁴ Telecommunications Relay Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, CC Docket No 98-67, 15 FCC Rcd 5140, 5152 (2000) (*Improved TRS Order*).

⁵ Telecommunications for the Deaf, Inc. Comments (TDI Comments) at 4.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(1).

mandatory minimum standards as TRS.⁸

2. For the reasons discussed below, we grant both Hamilton and Sprint's request for waiver, for a period of two years beginning on the release date of this order, of certain portions of the VRS requirements to the extent indicated herein. In addition, we extend this waiver to all other current or prospective VRS providers, for the same two year period, beginning on the release date of this order.

II. BACKGROUND

3. Title IV of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)⁹ requires the Commission to ensure that TRS is available to the extent possible and in the most efficient manner to persons with hearing or speech disabilities in the United States. The Commission first ordered all carriers to provide TRS services nationwide on July 26, 1991.¹⁰ On March 6, 2000, the Commission released the *Improved TRS Order*, which amended the rules governing the delivery of TRS by expanding the kinds of relay services available to consumers and by improving the quality of relay services. The *Improved TRS Order* changed many of the definitions and standards for traditional TRS and added speech-to-speech (STS) and Spanish relay services as requirements.¹¹ It also permitted the recovery of VRS costs through the interstate TRS funding mechanism.¹² In the *Improved TRS Order*, the Commission also tentatively concluded that the provision of VRS should not be mandatory at that time, due to its technological infancy, but that we should continue to monitor the state of VRS technology.¹³

4. On April 6, 2001, Hamilton filed a request for temporary waiver of certain aspects of the *Improved TRS Order* relating to the provision of VRS.¹⁴ Hamilton requests temporary, two-year waiver

⁸ The following minimum standards do not apply to VRS: competent skills in typing and spelling for CAs; the capability to communicate with ASCII and Baudot format, at any speed generally in use; transmission of conversations between TTY and voice callers in real time; and the provision of services 24 hours a day.

⁹ Pub.L. No. 101-336, § 401, 104 Stat. 327, 336-69; 47 U.S.C § 225. TRS enables people with hearing or speech disabilities to communicate by telephone with persons who may or may not have such disabilities. This is accomplished through TRS facilities that deploy special technology and are staffed by communications assistants (CAs) who relay conversations between persons using either text or voice telecommunications devices. To access TRS, a text telephone (TTY) user dials the telephone number of the local TRS center. For the TTY user, this first step - the outbound call to the TRS center - is functionally equivalent to receiving a "dial tone." The caller then gives the number of the party she desires to call to the CA. The CA, in turn, places an outbound voice call to the called party. The CA serves as the "link" in the conversation, converting all TTY messages from the caller into voice messages, and all voice messages from the called party into typed messages for the TTY user. The process is performed in reverse when a voice telephone user initiates the call to a TTY user. See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.601(5), (7). Other types of relay services use the CA to interpret the signed communication of one of the parties (video relay services) or to facilitate communications for individuals with speech disabilities (speech-to-speech relay services).

¹⁰ Telecommunications Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities and the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, *Report and Order and Request for Comments*, CC Docket No. 90-571, 6 FCC Rcd 4657 (1991) (1991 *Report and Order*).

¹¹ *Improved TRS Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 5148-51, 5154-55.

¹² *Id.* at 5153.

¹³ *Id.* at 5152.

¹⁴ *Hamilton Waiver Request*. Hamilton also requested clarification that section 64.603 of the Commission's rules does not require a provider of VRS to provide video-based STS or Spanish relay at this time. See *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 3-5. This request was addressed in a separate item. See generally, Telecommunications Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities; Recommended TRS Cost Recovery Guidelines; Request by Hamilton Telephone Company for Clarification and Temporary Waivers, CC Docket No. 98-67, *Memorandum Opinion and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (rel. Dec. 21, 2001) (*Cost Recovery MO&O*).

of portions of section 64.603 and 64.604 of the Commission's rules. Hamilton specifically seeks temporary waiver of the following requirements: (1) the types of calls that must be handled;¹⁵ (2) emergency call handling;¹⁶ (3) speed of answer;¹⁷ (4) equal access to interexchange carriers;¹⁸ and (5) pay-per-call services.¹⁹

5. On June 4, 2001, Sprint filed a similar request for temporary, two-year waiver of portions of section 64.603 and 64.604 of the Commission's rules.²⁰ Sprint seeks waiver of the same sections identified in Hamilton's waiver request, except for section 64.604(a)(3), which pertains to the types of calls that must be handled. Sprint also seeks waiver of any Commission rules that "may require providers of VRS to ensure that users are able to utilize American Sign Language to communicate with Spanish speaking individuals."²¹

6. On July 16, 2001 the Common Carrier Bureau (Bureau) issued a public notice seeking comment on Hamilton's waiver request.²² Comments were due on September 14, 2001 and reply comments were due on October 1, 2001. Comments were filed by Telecommunications for the Deaf, Inc. (TDI)²³ and the National Association of the Deaf (NAD).²⁴ A reply comment was filed by Sprint.²⁵

III. DISCUSSION

7. *Waiver Standard.* In analyzing Sprint and Hamilton's waiver requests, we consider established legal standards for waiver of the Commission's rules. The Commission will adhere strictly to its rules unless a party can demonstrate that "in the public interest the rule should be waived."²⁶ Furthermore, the Commission may only waive a provision of its rules for "good cause shown."²⁷ Under relevant case law, the applicant has the burden of showing good cause for a waiver: "[a]n applicant [for a waiver] faces a high hurdle even at the starting gate."²⁸ The Commission must take a "hard look" at applications for waiver²⁹ and must consider all relevant factors when determining if good cause exists.³⁰

¹⁵ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(3). Hamilton seeks waiver of the requirement to provide operator-assisted calls and to bill certain types of long distance calls to the end user.

¹⁶ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(4).

¹⁷ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(b)(2).

¹⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(b)(3).

¹⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(b)(6).

²⁰ Sprint Communications *Petition for Temporary Waiver* (filed June 4, 2001) (*Sprint Waiver Request*). Sprint also requested waiver of the "apparent requirement for Spanish VRS." Because we clarified in a previous order that there is no requirement for Spanish VRS, this request is moot. See *Cost Recovery MO&O* at paras. 25-27.

²¹ See *Sprint Waiver Request* at 9.

²² See Common Carrier Bureau Seeks Comment on Request for Temporary Waiver of Video Relay Service Requirements, *Public Notice*, DA 01-1706, CC Docket No. 98-67 (rel. July 16, 2001) (*VRS Public Notice*). The Bureau also sought comment on a similar waiver request by Sprint in that public notice.

²³ See Comments of Telecommunications for the Deaf, Inc. (filed Sept 14, 2001) (TDI Comments).

²⁴ See Comments of National Association of the Deaf (filed Sept. 14, 2001) (NAD Comments).

²⁵ See Reply Comments of Sprint (filed Oct. 1, 2001) (Sprint Reply Comments).

²⁶ *FPC v. Texaco Inc.*, 377 U.S. 33, 39 (1964).

²⁷ 47 C.F.R. §1.3.

²⁸ *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 1969).

²⁹ *Id.*

In addition, "[t]he agency must explain why deviation better serves the public interest, and articulate the nature of the special circumstances, to prevent discriminatory application and to put future parties on notice as to its operation."³¹ As discussed below, we find that Sprint and Hamilton have shown good cause for waiver of certain of the Commission's rules pertaining to VRS. Accordingly, we grant their waiver requests to the extent indicated herein. By granting a waiver, we intend to give providers time to refine their VRS technology before incurring significant costs to provide fully compliant service.

8. Hamilton and Sprint believe that the Commission should relax certain minimum standards for VRS to encourage service availability to customers and technology innovation during the exploratory phase of VRS.³² According to Hamilton, unless a waiver is granted during the early developmental stages of VRS, these requirements will deter, rather than encourage, the availability of VRS.³³ Sprint also believes that the development of VRS is being hampered by the significant costs of providing the service.³⁴ Hamilton explains that most of the requirements for which it requests waiver mirror the Commission's initial requirements for traditional TRS services, and that suspending some of the standards during the start-up years of this new service will allow providers to grow with the market.³⁵ Sprint also believes that the Commission's decision to require VRS providers to meet the minimum standards set forth in the *Improved TRS Order* may prevent VRS providers from experimenting with various technologies to develop efficient and effective VRS service.³⁶ The National Association of the Deaf (NAD) also states that the interests of the NAD and its constituents will be served when VRS evolves and becomes widely available.³⁷ Telecommunications for the Deaf, Inc. (TDI) also supports Hamilton and Sprint's requests for temporary waiver and states that strict compliance with the existing standards would be detrimental to the public interest.³⁸ TDI, however, also requests that a firm deadline be established to ensure that the goals of functional equivalence will be met.³⁹ We address each of Sprint and Hamilton's specific requests below.

(...continued from previous page)

³⁰ *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 416 (1971).

³¹ *Northeast Cellular Telephone Company, L.P. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990).

³² *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 5, *Sprint Waiver Request* at 5, TDI Comments at 1-4. VRS is currently being provided in certain areas by several providers.

³³ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 1.

³⁴ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 2. Sprint also states that the report filed by the Interstate Fund Advisory Council and the TRS Fund Administrator recommending guidelines for cost recovery for TRS services states that it is much more expensive to provide VRS than traditional TRS because, unlike traditional TRS, the provision of VRS requires the deployment of video technology. See *Recommended TRS Cost Recovery Guidelines*, CC Docket No. 98-67 at 7-8 (rel. November 9, 2000).

³⁵ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 1,6. Sprint also believes a waiver of such standards must be granted if it is to help the Commission achieve its goal of having affordable VRS available on a nation-wide basis. *Sprint Waiver Request* at 5.

³⁶ *Sprint Waiver Request* 4. The TRS Fund Administrator has informed Sprint that unless it can meet all of the minimum standards for VRS established by the commission, it is "not eligible for reimbursement from the Interstate TRS Fund for [VRS]" it provides. See Letter to Paula J. Holbrook, TRS Program Manager for Sprint from Maripat Brennan, Manager, Fund Administration (dated Feb. 14, 2001) (Attachment A to *Sprint Waiver Request*).

³⁷ NAD Comments at 1.

³⁸ TDI Comments at 1, 3.

³⁹ *Id.* at 1. In addition, TDI suggests that the Commission grant one year waivers and revisit the issue on its own motion at the end of that period. See TDI Comments at 3-4. Sprint also supports TDI's suggestion for review after a one year period. See Sprint Reply Comments at 1.

9. *Types of calls.* Hamilton requests a temporary two-year waiver of the requirement to handle all of the types of calls normally handled by common carriers.⁴⁰ Specifically, Hamilton requests a waiver of the requirement to provide operator assisted calls and to bill certain types of long distance calls to the end user.⁴¹ Hamilton recommends that VRS providers be able to provide either long distance service at no charge to the customer or long distance service via a calling card, for a period of two years. Hamilton suggests that long distance calling accomplished with calling cards, together with the provider's opportunity to voluntarily provide free long distance service, is a reasonable interim substitute that will aid in providers' ability to deploy VRS promptly. Hamilton does not believe that the burden on VRS customers will be significant if this rule is waived because approximately 80% of relay calls are local. Thus, Hamilton suggests that, given the Commission's desire to encourage the provision of VRS services, allowing end users to use calling cards or providing free long distance calls for such calls will both expedite the availability of new customer services and optimize the standards for all TRS services.⁴²

10. We acknowledge that it may be difficult at this time for VRS providers to offer operator-assisted calls and bill certain types long distance calls to the end-user. We find, however, that calling cards alone are not a viable alternative to ensure that long distance calling is available to all VRS users. The requirement of having a calling card available when making a VRS call may hinder users' ability to utilize this new service if callers are unaware that they need to have a calling card. In addition, not all consumers qualify for or have access to calling cards. To accommodate callers without calling cards, we agree with Hamilton that providing for free long distance calling will ensure that VRS is accessible to all users. Because long distance calls should only be a small portion of VRS calls, and VRS providers may recover their costs through the interstate TRS fund,⁴³ we find that this is an adequate alternative for VRS providers who have not yet set up billing mechanisms for long distance VRS calls using operator assistance and other types of billing mechanisms. Accordingly, we grant Hamilton's request for a temporary waiver of the requirement to offer operator assisted calls and billing for certain types of long distances calls. VRS providers must, however, allow VRS calls to be places using calling cards and/or provide free long distance calls during the wavier period.

11. *Emergency call handling.* Both Hamilton and Sprint request temporary two-year waivers of the Commission's rules stating that TRS providers must provide a system for incoming emergency calls that automatically and immediately transfers the caller to the nearest public safety answering point (PSAP).⁴⁴ Hamilton proposes instead that it be permitted to manually complete the emergency call to the PSAP in a speedy fashion. Under the proposed waiver, Hamilton and other TRS providers would be responsible for providing emergency call handling quickly and efficiently. Hamilton explains that only the automation process would be waived.⁴⁵ Hamilton believes that a waiver of this standard would allow time for providers to determine what the market's choice of technology will be before integration of the database into a particular technological platform. Automated call handling would then be deployed when the prevailing TRS technology can be identified.⁴⁶

12. Hamilton also states that during VRS's technological infancy, deferred automation will have a limited effect. Current VRS demand is largely confined to calls from a video relay center, as home

⁴⁰ See *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 6, citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(3).

⁴¹ *Id.* at 7.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ See *Improved TRS Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 5153, para. 24

⁴⁴ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 7-8; *Sprint Waiver Request* at 7-8, citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(a)(4).

⁴⁵ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 7.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

use of video relay facilities are not yet widely available.⁴⁷ Sprint explains that in North Carolina, for example, an end-user must travel to a designated location, such as a mall, where the VRS provider has installed the video equipment necessary to make a VRS call.⁴⁸ Therefore, the likelihood of an incoming emergency call via VRS service is minimal, as it would require the caller faced with an emergency to travel to a video relay center.⁴⁹ Even in cases when a VRS user is able to make calls from the home or office, Sprint states that VRS is still not a viable option for emergency calls because the set-up time is much longer than the set-up time to make a TTY call.⁵⁰ Accordingly, Sprint and Hamilton believe a waiver is appropriate at this time.⁵¹

13. We agree with Sprint and Hamilton that a temporary waiver of the automation requirement for emergency call handling for VRS calls is appropriate at this time. On February 23, 2001, we granted a similar six-month waiver for the emergency call handling requirement for traditional TRS services.⁵² In that case, carriers needed additional time to establish a database that included all of the PSAPs in the country.⁵³ Similarly, VRS providers need to develop and utilize an emergency call-handling database, as well as time to adjust to new and developing VRS technologies to effectively handle VRS emergency calls. TDI also concurs that it is unrealistic to require an automated system to be in place due to its technical limitations and the need for more research and monitoring.⁵⁴ Accordingly, we find that a temporary two-year waiver is appropriate in this case.

14. TDI also believes that every VRS provider should be required to make a clear and bold written statement on their website and any promotional materials explaining the shortcomings and potential dangers of VRS in contacting a subscriber's local 911 center.⁵⁵ We agree that VRS users would benefit from this information, and therefore require that VRS providers make a clear and bold written statement on their website and any VRS promotional materials explaining the shortcomings and potential dangers of using VRS to place an emergency call using 911.

15. *Speed of answer.* TRS requirements mandate that 85 percent of relay calls must be answered within 10 seconds by any method which results in the caller's call being placed, not put in queue or on hold.⁵⁶ These calls are measured by providers on a daily basis and take into account abandoned calls.⁵⁷ Because this rule is based on projected call volumes and such projections are difficult to make for this new service with unknown demand, Hamilton believes that the daily measurement requirement is problematic. Hamilton believes that these requirements will result in such heavy and costly staffing needs that a prudent TRS operator would be seriously deterred from offering voluntary VRS.⁵⁸

⁴⁷ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 7-8.

⁴⁸ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 7.

⁴⁹ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 7-8, *Sprint Waiver Request* at 7.

⁵⁰ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 7.

⁵¹ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 7-8, *Sprint Waiver Request* at 7-8.

⁵² See *In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Service And Speech-to-Speech for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, Order, DA 01-492, 16 FCC Rcd 4662, 4666-68, paras. 10-16 (2001).

⁵³ *Id.* at 4666, para. 12.

⁵⁴ TDI Comments at 8.

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 8-9.

⁵⁶ 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(b)(2). This is also known as the "85/10" rule.

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 8. Examples of such costs include: the need for new and specially trained CAs for VRS calls, the shortage of qualified interpreters, and the costs for daily tracking of calls. See TDI Comments at 9.

(continued....)

Hamilton believes a temporary waiver should be granted until providers have had sufficient experience with the offering, and demand has developed and stabilized at a level that allows reasonable staffing decisions.⁵⁹ Therefore, Hamilton suggests that the waiver provide for a temporary speed of answer standard comparable to the standard for early TRS, and recommends that the standard be that 85% of calls must be answered within 10 seconds, measured on a monthly basis, without the inclusion of abandoned calls.⁶⁰ TDI also agrees that a waiver is warranted, but maintains that providers must be strongly encouraged to diligently meet the needs of callers. Thus, TDI believes that a firm deadline should be established for service providers to meet the 85/10 rule imposed on traditional relay services.⁶¹

16. We concur that a temporary two-year waiver of section 64.604(b)(2) is appropriate in this instance. By allowing providers additional time to comply with the speed of answer requirements, we will encourage more entrants into the VRS market and help provide more time for technology to develop. Because demand for VRS is, as yet, undetermined, the 85/10 rule would likely keep potential providers out of the market, thereby hindering the development and growth of VRS. Furthermore, because VRS is not mandatory at this time, relaxation of this requirement should help simulate the growth of VRS. We decline, however, to implement Hamilton's recommended interim standard.⁶² Nevertheless, we urge providers to work to diligently meet the needs of callers during the time period that his waiver is in place.

17. *Equal access to interexchange carriers.* Hamilton and Sprint also request a temporary two-year waiver of the requirement that TRS users have access to their chosen interexchange carrier through TRS, and to all other operator services, to the same extent that such access is provided to voice users.⁶³ Hamilton explains that the Commission provided for state exemptions of the equal access requirement during the early stages of TRS development.⁶⁴ In addition, Hamilton notes that customers will be able to reach the carrier of their choice if calling cards serve as the interim method to use an interexchange carrier's services; or Hamilton argues, in the alternative, that this will not be an issue if there is no charge for long distance calls.⁶⁵ Sprint states that the systems that are necessary to hand off a video teleconferencing call to a carrier preferred by the end user simply do not exist at this time and need to be developed.⁶⁶ TDI supports a waiver of this nature, but urges that once a technical solution has been developed the waiver should be lifted.

18. We find that a temporary two-year waiver is appropriate at this time. Two years should provide carriers with enough time to develop, test, and implement a technical solution. If a technical solution is available in less than two years, we strongly encourage providers to provide access to callers' interexchange carriers of choice at that time.

(...continued from previous page)

Sprint states that to meet this requirement, VRS providers will have to hire more qualified sign language interpreters than would otherwise be justified based on the volume of VRS traffic. *See Sprint Waiver Request* at 5.

⁵⁹ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 8-9.

⁶⁰ *Id.* at 9.

⁶¹ TDI Comments at 9-10. TDI also notes that a potential VRS vendor has indicated that it will offer a service that meets the 85/10 requirement. Thus, TDI believes the waiver period need not be extensive and suggests a maximum of one to years for the waiver.

⁶² *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 9.

⁶³ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 9; *Sprint Waiver Request* at 8, citing 64.604(b)(3).

⁶⁴ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 9.

⁶⁵ *Id.* at 9. *See also infra* at paras. 12-14.

⁶⁶ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 8.

19. *Pay-per-call services.* Finally, Sprint and Hamilton request waiver of the requirement that VRS providers be capable of handling pay-per-call services (900 number calls).⁶⁷ Hamilton notes that the expense of handling such calls is likely to be considerable, and calls of this type were not required during the developmental stage of traditional TRS.⁶⁸ Thus, Hamilton believes that such services are another example of a service that cannot be provided until VRS is integrated into Hamilton's relay platform, which in turn, must wait until a technology is chosen. Accordingly, Hamilton seeks a waiver so it can begin providing VRS now, and notes that it will add other services, such as access to 900 number calling, when they become feasible. In addition, Hamilton notes that mandating such a capability for VRS at this time may be counter productive to the Commission's goal of encouraging VRS development.⁶⁹ Sprint also states that it is unlikely that there is going to be high demand for pay-per-call calls from VRS centers, and that is unlikely that a person making a 900 number call will travel to a remote site to use VRS.⁷⁰ Sprint also notes that it will require additional time during the next two years to develop the necessary technology for such services.⁷¹ TDI also believes that an extension of one to two years should be sufficient to find such a solution for the delivery of this service via VRS.⁷²

20. We agree, and accordingly find that a two-year temporary waiver of the requirement to be capable of handling pay-per-call service is appropriate at this time. Because the demand for pay-per-call VRS services is expected to be low, we see no reason to burden VRS providers with this costly requirement at this time.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

21. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 0.91, 0.291, 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, 1.3, that the request of the Hamilton Telephone Company for waiver of section 64.604(a)(3) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.604(a)(3), IS GRANTED, for a period of two years, beginning on the release date of this order, and is extended to all VRS providers, current or prospective, for the same period of this waiver.

22. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the requests filed by Hamilton Telephone Company and Sprint Communications for waiver of sections 64.604(a)(4), 64.604(b)(2), 64.604(b)(3), and 64.604(b)(6) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.604(a)(4), 64.604(b)(2), 64.604(b)(3), and 64.604(b)(6) ARE GRANTED, for a period of two years, beginning on the release date of this order, and are extended to all VRS providers, current or prospective, for the same period of this waiver

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Jeffrey J. Carlisle
Senior Deputy Bureau Chief,
Common Carrier Bureau

⁶⁷ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 8; *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 9-10, citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.604(b)(6).

⁶⁸ *Hamilton Waiver Request* at 9.

⁶⁹ *Id.* at 9-10

⁷⁰ *Sprint Waiver Request* at 8.

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² TDI Comments at 10.